<u>Premium</u> 16% 12%	Premium 6%	Premium (2) 3%	
		3%	
12%			
	1%	N/A (3)	
3%	16%	6%	
5%	31%	3%	
5%	9%	1%	
8%	N/A (3)	N/A (3)	
	•		s with similar non-labele
	5% 8% ucted in 2008 and 200 ion at http://www.imt.c	5% 31% 5% 9% 8% N/A (3) ucted in 2008 and 2009 and compared ENERG ion at http://www.imt.org/rating-value. 2) Lower mation, "Rating and Disclosing the Energy Performance	5% 31% 3% 5% 9% 1% 8% N/A (3) N/A (3) ucted in 2008 and 2009 and compared ENERGY STAR-labeled buildings in the United States ion at http://www.imt.org/rating-value. 2) Lower vacancy rates. 3) Not reported. mation, "Rating and Disclosing the Energy Performance of Buildings: A Market-Based Solution to Unlock